



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/516,993

12/06/2004

Sami Uskela

089229.00042

1328

32294 7590 07/25/2007  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.  
14TH FLOOR  
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT  
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, SIMON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/25/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/516,993

Applicant(s)

USKELA, SAMI

Examiner

SIMON D. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ibanez et al. (US 2003/0026230).

Regarding claims 15-16, Ibanez disclose a data transmission, comprising: a plurality of transmission units (figs. 1, paragraphs 24-25), wherein the plurality of transmission units using a single packet data context, wherein the transmission units are identified by IP addresses (paragraphs 45, 48).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-9, 11-14, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maclean (2002/0101859) in view of Ibanez et al. (2003/0026230).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Maclean discloses a packet data transmission method (figs.1,4a-b, abstract), comprising: employing a packet protocol for data transmission (paragraphs 23-24); identifying participant with IP addresses (paragraphs 24, 39, 42-43); activating a packet data context (step 219 of fig.4a, paragraph 48); and transmitting data at a scheduled time (column 1 lines 63-65, column 4 lines 20-51); transmitting the data to the participant (abstract, paragraph 37). However, Maclean fails to teach one PDP context for a plurality of IP addresses.

Ibanez, in the same field of invention, discloses activating a single PDP context to a plurality of IP addresses (paragraphs 45, 48, 26, 28, figs. 2, 4-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Maclean, modified by Ibanez to send a packet data to a plurality of participants which is a potentially save time and cost of operating the data packet system.

Regarding claims 2, Maclean further discloses the MS activating the packet data (paragraph 48, step 219 of fig.4a).

Regarding claims 3, Maclean further discloses identifying one or more units of terminal equipments with IP addresses (paragraphs 39, 42-43, figs. 2-3).

Regarding claim 4-5, 17-18, Ibanez further discloses the MS termination sending/receiving packet data from more than one Internet addresses using one packet data context (figs.2, 4, 5, paragraphs 45, 48) of a same type (paragraphs 26-27, 39).

Regarding claims 6, 13, Maclean further discloses activating the packet data context between the MS and GGSN (figs. 1, 4a-4b).

Regarding claim 7, Maclean further discloses transferring data between the MS and GGSN relating to more than one IP address using one packet data context (paragraphs 39-44, figs.2-3, 4a-b).

Regarding claims 8, 14, Maclean further discloses the quality of service is in use (paragraph 38).

Regarding claim 9, Ibanez teaches or suggests the MS sending a request for a new IP address (paragraphs 35, 43-44, 49, 54).

Regarding claim 12, Maclean further discloses the terminal is a mobile station and involving in the packet transmission to other equipments (RAN, SGSN, GGSN), wherein the packet embedded with the MS and the equipments' addresses (figs. 2-3, 4a-b, paragraphs 38-44).

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maclean (2002/0101859) and Ibanez et al. (2003/0026230) in view of Kumaki et al. (2002/0191562).

Regarding claim 10, the modified Maclean fails to teach or suggest the MS sending a request for releasing the IP address.

Kumaki discloses a MS sending a request for releasing an IP address (paragraphs 186,552). Therefore, it would have been obviously to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Maclean, modified by Kumaki in

order to save cost of the service when the mobile station does not involve in a packet transmission.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The new art issued to Ibanez disclosed activating a single PDP context for a plurality of IP addresses as pointed out in the above rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (571) 272-7899.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

600 Dulany, Alexandria, VA 22314


Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Customer Service Window  
located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Simon Nguyen

July 19, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Nguyen', with a large, sweeping flourish extending from the end of the name.

**SIMON NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**